3: Reay E-4, 5 (1951) 1953 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

headdresses. At the conclusion of the initiation, some of the initiates are presented with the *otohu* ornaments. (Formerly, it was always a distinguished warrior who presented these.) The initiates then fast for a day and a night. That night, there is sexual licence for the senior villagers, a temporary lifting of tabus on incest and adultery, but the initiates themselves are not permitted to participate.

In interpreting the initiation ceremonies of the Orokaiva, Chinnery and Beaver state that " the idea . . . seems to be to instil absolute and lasting terror into the candidates, and to make them think that their elders have beaten off the spirits ; while in this receptive and chastened frame of mind, the lads, imbued with the idea of the power of the men, will pay attention to the instruction given. There appears to be an idea that the spirits of the dead are present, and that the initiated, *i.e.* the living, are keeping them away from the candidates."[6]

Amongst the living, the initiation ritual juxtaposes the two groups, initiated and uninitiated, the one group terrified and utterly helpless, and the other well able to deal with the *embahi* spirits and drive away danger. Thus the respect for seniority, which is informally learned during childhood, is finally established.

An Erikson-type psychoanalytic interpretation would doubtless find in the *embahi's* threat to devour the boys, with the menacing reiteration " Bite, bite, bite ! " a dramatization of the *meni orosati's* guilt at biting the mother. I have not enough data to confirm or deny the admissibility of such an interpretation.

Above all, initiation involves the explicit instruction of the boys in the *otohu* virtues. This instruction takes place during their period of seclusion in the *oro*. Later, when *otohu* ornaments are given to some of them, they are again exhorted in detail to practise these virtues. The possession of an *otohu* imposes a social obligation on the wearer to " live up to it," and the prestige associated with this ornament indubitably ensures that a large number of people do in fact approximate to the ideal *otohu* patterns of behaviour.

(3) Sanctions

In Orokaiva society, sanctions operate diffusely and need no specific person's direction to put them into effect. The *embo kiti*, whom F. E. Williams called a " clan headman," but who is really more of a village headman whose position is hereditary within a certain lineage of the clan, has a limited authority which is backed by no sanctions. He has no power to reward or punish, except by making obvious his approval or disapproval of various lines of action. In fact, there is no rewarding and punishing authority at all.

Retaliation seems to have been the commonest sanction in former times, in the form of direct violence or the more subtle method of sorcery.[7] Retaliation by sorcery may still be practised ; I have no information on this point. Certainly deaths are still attributed to sorcery. When (during 1950) several people from the same village

[6] E. W. P. Chinnery and W. N. Beaver, in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. XLV, 1915.

[7] F. E. Williams, *Orokaiva Society*, pp. 327–329.

3: Reay E-4, 5 (1951) 1953 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

681 754 [648] died within a couple of months, these deaths were said to have been the result of sorcery. There was no strenuous effort to trace the sorcerer, because knowledge of his identity would bring the obligation to exercise fatal punishment, which would involve trouble with the Administration.

681 684 Retaliation by direct violence still takes place, although the Orokaiva are generally careful not to let it have a fatal result. If a woman is found to have committed adultery, her husband thrashes her. Traditionally, he has a right to take direct action against the co-respondent also, but nowadays he is more likely to tell his *naname* (friend), who calls the adulterer a series of uncomplimentary names in public and makes his position so intolerable that he will leave the village. The offender may go into the bush for a while, but generally he goes to some other village where he has a *naname* of his own who will give him shelter and hospitality.

If a woman suspects her husband of adultery, she accuses him loudly in public, and if the husband cannot satisfy her that her suspicions are ill-founded, she will gather her few belongings in a string bag and set out for her own village. This act of the woman, while she is in a mood of righteous anger, is regarded as retaliation. "Now," she cries as a parting shot, "you will have no one to cook for you!" Actually, it is not difficult for the man to find a friend's wife or some kinswoman to cook for him, but the routine of his life is upset.

681 Clearly, the sanction of retaliation is severely limited by the modern prohibition of killing, for it is necessarily somewhat abortive without the freedom to carry it through. Nowadays, the pattern is to leave the field rather than stay and fight it out. In domestic squabbles, either the guilty parties or the wronged ones who are unable to retaliate can leave the village until tempers have cooled. If arguments between segments of a village recur and seem to be developing into a feud, one section can break away to found a new village at a little distance from the first.

Retaliation is impossible when crimes are carried out surreptitiously so that the crime is discovered but the criminal is not known. There remains the sanction of self-injury, which makes the wrongdoer feel sorry for the wronged one and therefore ashamed of having caused him to suffer. F. E. Williams cites two cases of theft which illustrate the operation of this peculiarly oblique sanction. To make the thief realize the enormity of his offence, the owner of a stolen watermelon hacked the rest of his crop to pieces, and the owner of a stolen spear chopped down his house where he had left the spear. The injured man aggravates his own injury, so that [152] pity for him will induce shame in the culprit. This attitude on the part of the injured man is largely a blend of anger and self-pity. It is called *sisira*.[8]

152 681 This sanction demonstrates how the Orokaiva tends to take revenge upon the person who hurt his feelings by punishing himself. This is something of this self-punishing, too, in the wearing of the *heratu* (plant-emblem) as a symbol of abstention from food belonging to or prepared by someone who has wronged him.[9]

[8] F. E. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 333.
[9] *Idem.*, p. 116.

3: Reay E-4, 5 (1951) 1953 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

Conclusion

In conclusion, it could be said that the Orokaiva have a fairly weak system of social control. The sanctions against wrongdoing are all diffuse, and do not always work successfully. There seems to be a complete absence of any effective judicial system. A thief or a murdering sorcerer has to be caught in the act to be punished at all. There is no machinery for discovering the culprit.[10] In a domestic crisis, a woman will "retaliate" by leaving her husband ostensibly with no one to cook for him, but it is easy for him to find someone willing to do his cooking. He does this by invoking pity. If a situation is unbearable, an individual can always leave the village. A woman can go to her kinsfolk, and a man to his *naname's* village.

The only person an Orokaiva can punish effectively is himself. There seems to be a good deal of impotent rage in the destruction of a man's own property in a fit of *sisiva*. Also, the wronged man is sorry for himself, and he ensures that everyone else, including the person who wronged him, feels sorry for him, too. The masochistic sanction of self-injury, with the purpose of invoking the criminal's pity, is in direct contrast to the outward aggression of the Orokaiva's traditional relations with the hostile Tagaho and Managalasi. It is possible that the weakness of the internal judicial system was originally due to the necessity for keeping overt aggression geared towards the enemy groups. To maintain constant warfare with outsiders, internal aggression had to be severely limited, even aggression towards wrongdoers. Hence, perhaps, the unwillingness to ferret out the culprit when a theft occurs or a person dies from sorcery, unless the criminal is actually caught in the act.

The relationship between institutionalized friendship and social control is ambiguous. A man's *naname* are his contemporaries who were secluded with him in the *oro* during his initiation, and other friends he may acquire later. Every man has many *naname* scattered throughout neighbouring and distant villages. Being somebody's *naname* constitutes a bond which overrides all other considerations. A man's loyalty to his *naname* is said to be stronger than his loyalty to his family and his relatives. Although, theoretically, a man who is *otohu* never quarrels and brawls, if he is involved in brawls in defence of a *naname* he is paradoxically judged to be more *otohu* than ever. So strong is the bond between *naname* that in fact men cannot conceive of committing offences against anyone who stands in this relationship to them.[11] This attitude tends to be extended to friends of a man's *naname*, so normally there are very few people in the community who are potential victims of, say, a man's impulse to steal. Considered as an instrument of social control, institutionalized friendship minimizes the possibility of deviance.

Formerly, the conduct of wars and cannibal raids was determined largely by this institution. The Koropata people who went to help their allies at Isivita in a

[10] L. A. Flint (*Papuan Annual Report*, 1924–25, p. 45) describes various ways of tracing the sorcerer, but says nothing of the effectiveness of these methods. Certainly in 1951 the Wasida and Koropata people seemed sceptical of these methods and said that they did not bother trying to discover the sorcerer by these means.

[11] One informant went so far as to say that if a man were to discover that he had committed some offence against his *naname* "by mistake," he would kill himself.

3: Reay E-4, 5 (1951) 1953 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

572 681 724

war against the Managalasi were those who had friends at Isivita and those who were friends (*naname*) of men already committed by friendship to go. The conduct of warfare depended upon these personal links between *naname*, who had a binding obligation to fight for one another. The Wasida people still say of their traditional enemies (the Togaho, the Managalasi, and the Orokaiva of Sairope), " We have no friends among them." Having no friends among them, and having no friends in common with them, they were free to fight.

Institutionalized friendship also operates against social control, in regard to the consequences of wrongdoing. If a man is driven from his own village by shame for a wrong he has committed, he is welcomed by his *naname*, whose hospitality is always ready. It is impossible for a man to be a social outcast, as he can stay in his *naname's* village as long as he likes as a welcome and honoured guest.

Therefore, social control amongst the Orokaiva is perhaps weaker than it is in the more formalized societies, because of the internal stresses imposed by constantly recurring warfare, and because also the efficient conduct of wars and cannibal raids involved the institutionalization of friendship to such a degree that it provides, even to-day, a loophole for the deviant. On the other hand, this institution itself tends to minimize the possibility of deviance by providing each man with a category of people towards whom it is inconceivable that he should act otherwise than in strict accordance with the *otohu* ideals.

MARIE REAY.